

# THE COLLINS CENTER UPDATE

Volume 9, Issue 1

October - December 2006



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE  
CARLISLE, PENNSYLVANIA



## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- **Belize 2021: The National Security Framework**
- **Three Volume Network Centric Warfare Case Study Published**
- **International Diplomacy Exercise at Georgetown University**
- **Strategic Leader Staff Ride Program Update**
- **Military Operations Research Society (MORS) Workshop**

## **BELIZE 2021: THE NATIONAL SECURITY FRAMEWORK**

*Professor B.F. Griffard and Colonel Dale C. Eikmeier*

*Operations and Gaming Division, CSL*

Within Central America stability and security would help provide an environment for sustained economic improvement and prosperity, conditions essential to reducing the region's endemic poverty. An important step in achieving that goal would be the completion of the Belize National Security Strategy Formulation Process.

On November 7, 2006 strategic planners representing Belize's security organizations and other government agencies convened National Security Strategy Formulation Process Workshop #3 to address the final piece of their National Security Strategy (NSS) formulation process. Meeting in Belize City, they spent the next three and one-half days developing recommendations for a redesigned national security framework capable of executing and monitoring security policy.

The current absence of an institutionalized process for long-range national security planning has placed Belize at a strategic disadvantage. To reduce risk and achieve Vision 2021, Belize requires an integrated national security architecture that develops policy, coordinates action plans, monitors execution, reviews progress and maintains a long-term perspective. Achieving these capabilities requires a redesign of the existing national security architecture so that it provides long-range planning, coordination

between cabinet ministers and their agencies and monitoring of security programs. Achieving this capability can be the difference between success and failure of the national security strategy.

In order to formulate recommended changes that would strengthen the executive branch's strategic planning capabilities, Belize's interagency planners reviewed current Belizean government processes and organizations and studied examples of foreign national security systems. As in the two previous workshops conducted in June and August 2006, they were assisted by teams from the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) and the United Kingdom's Ministry of Defence Security Sector Development Advisory Team (SSDAT). Professor B.F. Griffard and Colonel Dale Eikmeier from the USAWC Center for Strategic Leadership, and Mr. Thomas R. Hamilton-Baillie representing the SSDAT provided instructional and facilitation support.

With the completion of this three phase effort the Belizean government has developed a workable national security strategy that if implemented, along with the recommended structural changes in the security architecture provides an excellent roadmap towards Belize 2021. Achieving the objectives laid out by the Belizean government in their Vision 2021 will not be an easy task. Enroute they must combat the criminal activity and violence brought on by the poverty mentioned above. Since many of the issues have transnational origins it is to Central America's benefit to follow the Belizean example and develop a regional strategy that charts a stable and secure path to the future.



BG Lloyd Gillett, Commander, Belize Defense Force (front row, 3rd from left), and Mr. Leonard Hill, Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy Belize (front row, 4th from left), and the Belize NSS Planning Team.

| Report Documentation Page  |                                    |                                     |   | Form Approved<br>OMB No. 0704-0188                  |                                 |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. |                                    |                                     |   |   |                                 |
| 1. REPORT DATE<br><b>DEC 2006</b>  |                                    | 2. REPORT TYPE                      |   | 3. DATES COVERED<br><b>00-10-2006 to 00-12-2006</b> |                                 |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE<br><b>The Collins Center Update. Volume 9, Issue 1, October-December 2006</b>  |                                    |                                     |   | 5a. CONTRACT NUMBER                                 |                                 |
|  |                                    |                                     |   | 5b. GRANT NUMBER                                    |                                 |
|  |                                    |                                     |   | 5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER                          |                                 |
| 6. AUTHOR(S)   |                                    |                                     |   | 5d. PROJECT NUMBER                                  |                                 |
|  |                                    |                                     |   | 5e. TASK NUMBER                                     |                                 |
|  |                                    |                                     |   | 5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER                                |                                 |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)<br><b>U.S. Army War College, Center for Strategic Leadership, 650 Wright Avenue, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5049</b>   |                                    |                                     |   | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER            |                                 |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)  |                                    |                                     |   | 10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)                    |                                 |
|  |                                    |                                     |   | 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)              |                                 |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT<br><b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>  |                                    |                                     |   |   |                                 |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES  |                                    |                                     |   |   |                                 |
| 14. ABSTRACT   |                                    |                                     |   |   |                                 |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS  |                                    |                                     |   |   |                                 |
| 16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:  |                                    |                                     | 17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT<br><b>Same as Report (SAR)</b> | 18. NUMBER OF PAGES<br><b>4</b>                     | 19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON |
| a. REPORT<br><b>unclassified</b>   | b. ABSTRACT<br><b>unclassified</b> | c. THIS PAGE<br><b>unclassified</b> |   |   |                                 |

The Issue Paper covering this workshop can be accessed at: <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/Publications/IP11-06.pdf>.

— CSL —

## THREE VOLUME NETWORK CENTRIC WARFARE CASE STUDY PUBLISHED

**Captain Raymond G. De Lucio**  
*Science and Technology Division, CSL*

The United States Army War College's Center for Strategic Leadership (CSL), in conjunction with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Office of Force Transformation recently completed a three volume case study on Network Centric Warfare (NCW). Following the 2005 release of the initial case study, *U.S. V Corps and 3rd Infantry Division (Mechanized) during Operation Iraqi Freedom (March-April 2003)*, the Office of Force Transformation recognized the need to expand the case study. CSL was asked to further investigate NCW a force multiplier while addressing the impact of NCW at soldier and developmental levels.

Over the past decade, the United States Armed Forces have been in the process of transforming from an Industrial Age to an Information Age military. This transformation is a long way from being completed; however, the maneuver phase of Operation Iraqi Freedom demonstrated the emerging power and potential of information-networked forces. The three volume case study on NCW illustrates this transformation by taking a frank and candid approach to the topic.

CSL formed a study group comprised of subject matter experts and recent combat veterans to conduct relevant research through documents and personal interviews to further the examination of NCW. The focus was to investigate past, present and developing command, control, communications, and computers (C4) architectures; potential operational and strategic implications of NCW; and telling the NCW story using battle vignettes while enhanc-

ing information found in the original case study.

Initially released in 2005 and published in June 2006, Volume I, titled *Operations: U.S. V Corps and 3rd Infantry Division (Mechanized) during Operation Iraqi Freedom (March-April 2003)*, was a collaborative effort by COL (R) Dave Cammons, COL (R) John B. Tisserand III, COL (R) Duane E. Williams, LTC Alan Seise and CPT Doug Lindsay. Previous case studies on the topic of NCW adequately covered the "shooter-sensor" interface from a systems perspective. None, however, addressed the impact of NCW from the human perspective. This is the essence of land warfare, and why this study is so important. "Operations" uses the metrics provided in the NCW Conceptual Framework as the guide in the conduct of the analysis concerning the applicability of NCW tenets during the conduct of major offensive combat operations.

Volume II, *A View of Command, Control, Communications and Computer Architectures at the Dawn of Network Centric Warfare*, released in September 2006, is co-authored by COL (R) Kevin Cogan and CPT Raymond DeLucio, with COL (R) Dave Cammons serving as Project Director. This volume provides the military reader with three insights: first, a historical view of the advances in technology that ultimately enabled a computer communications network; second, an encapsulation of the Army C4 architecture for V Corps and 3 ID during the two specific timeframes referred to as pre-OIF and OIF-I and; lastly an examination of future communications programs that are underway for the next generation of C4 architecture with respect to the ability of the DoD acquisition process to keep pace with the rapid advances in technology.

Volume III, *Network Centric Warfare Insights*, was released in September 2006. Written by COL (R) John B. Tisserand III, this volume builds upon the results of the initial case study with emphasis on

the operational aspects of V Corps and 3ID during the March and April 2003 time period. This volume is meant to provide the military reader with two sets of insights: first, an introductory view of implications of NCW for the operational and strategic levels of war, and second, a series of six short tactical-level battle stories or vignettes that can be used to further the study of network centric warfare tenets and to illustrate the impact of new technologies on organizations, leaders, and combat effectiveness.

The three volumes of the case study have been printed separately but each contain a CD with all three case studies. The electronic versions are available through the Center for Strategic Leadership website at the following address: <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/Studies.asp>

— CSL —

## INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY NEGOTIATION EXERCISE AT GEORGETOWN

**Mr. Ritchie Dion**  
*Operations and Gaming Division, CSL*

The Center for Strategic Leadership (CSL) partnered with the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy at Georgetown University on 17-18 November 2006 to conduct a International Diplomacy Negotiation Exercise. Members of CSL's Operations and Gaming Division modified a version of the Center's International Fellows Coalition Building Exercise and performed simulation controller duties at the Georgetown University's Intercultural Center for the School of Foreign Service's graduate students participating in the exercise.

The U.S. Army War College has provided support to academic exercises and simulations for over six years, including the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy's SIMULEX conducted each fall at Tufts University. LTC William Mooney, an Army Fellow at the Georgetown Institute for the





Study of Diplomacy (ISD), assisted with the October 2006 SIMULEX, and recognized the benefits that a similar exercise might provide the Georgetown Foreign Service and national security students. This negotiation exercise is a unique educational opportunity that helps illuminate and reinforce many of the concepts of policymaking and strategy development taught at Georgetown. Accordingly, LTC Mooney coordinated the event, and acted as the Senior Controller.

Student participants in the exercise represented a broad cross section of Georgetown's School of Foreign Service. These Masters Degree candidates included students from across the globe and this exercise provided them the opportunity to develop and observe different perspectives in solving a near real-world crisis.

This scenario-driven exercise is set in 2016, and focuses an unstable situation in the South Caucasus region. The students were divided into six teams, each team representing a nation with competitive interests in the region. Provided with their nation's objectives vis-a-vis the region and the crisis, the teams were required to develop and execute negotiating strategies to achieve these strategic national objectives while simultaneously attempting to negotiate a consensus international response to the crisis. The teams engaged in an extended series of student-initiated bi-, tri-, and multi-lateral negotiations whose goals were to end hostilities, introduce an appropriate international peacekeeping force into the region, and resolve sovereignty and re-settlement issues. The CSL control team provided the scenario drivers and portrayed other regional and international actors when appropriate.

Ambassador William Hill, the former U.S. Ambassador to Moldova; along with members of the faculty of Georgetown's School of Foreign Service; Washington DC area Army and Air Force Senior Fellows; and a visiting professor from Harvard Law School served as mentors for the students. They advised the participants on the politics, militaries, economies, and cultures of the regional actors.

The exercise concluded with a "UN Ministerial Meeting," chaired by Ambassador Beth Jones, who portrayed a special representative of the UN Secretary General. Each student team presented their current positions within the ongoing negotiations, and the Ambassador then led them in a dialogue on the challenges inherent in moving from conceptual to actual implementation

of the students' proposed "resolution pathway." During the subsequent after action review, there was general consensus from all involved that the exercise was a valuable experience for the students. Certainly for the USAWC this event was a beneficial strategic outreach opportunity, one which enhances the relationship between Georgetown University and the United States Army.

---

## — CSL —

### STRATEGIC LEADER STAFF RIDE PROGRAM

*By COL Scott McConnell*  
*Operations and Gaming Division, CSL*

July, August, and September proved to be the busiest, but most meaningful, months for the Center for Strategic Leadership's (CSL) Strategic Leader Staff Ride Program since its inception in 2003. On behalf of the Commandant and the USAWC, CSL hosted seven Strategic Leader Staff Rides (SLSRs) and Senior Leader Seminars (SLS) and provided a unique opportunity for over 100 participants that included approximately 60 corporate vice presidents or higher, as well as senior leaders from academia, and federal and state governments to learn about themselves, their organizations, and their Army. These successful SLSRs also served as springboard for continued relations between the Army, the USAWC and SLSR participants and participant organizations.

An integral part of the U.S. Army War College's strategic outreach program and teamed with the Army War College Foundation for support, the Strategic Leader Staff Ride Program uses the enduring relevance of the battle of Gettysburg as a key to foster and promote shared understanding and discussion regarding the challenges key strategic leaders faced with regard to the Battle of Gettysburg. The nature of those challenges transcends time and are often predominant in civilian and military organization environments today. The relevance of these challenges allows USAWC facilitators to lead meaningful SLSR participant dialogue that increases awareness and allows the free exchange of insights on the most important strategic issues facing the Army, academia, the government, and the business community.

This quarter's SLSR program activities included a Strategic Leader Seminar with the Columbia Business School and SLSRs

with Boston Consulting Group, RPM, International, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Secretary of the Army, Riverside Health Services, Incorporated, Universal Health Services, Incorporated, and Harley-Davidson Motorcycles. For each program, there was a very successful effort to integrate select members of the USAWC faculty and staff that have relevant professional skills, responsibilities, and experiences, with each group. This personal involvement by select USAWC faculty and staff, aside from providing greater depth of understanding, serves as a foundation for expanding and strengthening relationships between the USAWC SLSR participant organizations and individuals.

For a minimal investment of time—reading preparation materials (*Killer Angels*, by Michael Sharra and a Battle of Gettysburg primer) and the two and a half days spent on the battlefield at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania learning strategic lessons, and at Carlisle Barracks learning about strategic leadership—SLSR participants derive an invaluable experience that helps them to identify and overcome challenges they face as strategic leaders of large organizations. The experience benefits both the USAWC staff and faculty and the participating organization. SLSR participants leave the Center for Strategic Leadership better informed and understanding of the Army's strategic outreach messages. USAWC SLSR participants derive an incalculable measure of understanding from the exchange of ideas with SLSR participants. But even more importantly, SLSR participants leave knowing that the USAWC can serve as a partner in an exchanges of ideas. This exchange of ideas serves both organization's long-term goals.

---

## — CSL —

### MILITARY OPERATIONS RESEARCH SOCIETY (MORS) WORKSHOP

*Colonel Robert Hume*  
*Science and Technology Division, CSL*

The Center for Strategic Leadership (CSL), U.S. Army War College, hosted a Military Operations Research Society (MORS) Workshop, 14-16 November 2006. The Workshop, titled *Analyzing the Value of Infrastructure*, was conducted to help establish a foundation for measuring the military value of infrastructure and to project future infrastructure requirements

from a joint perspective. Mr. Chip Cleckner, Operations Research Group Senior Analyst, served as CSLs primary point of contact for the event.

### The Workshop

A total of 56 participants, representing a wide range of infrastructure experts from across the Department of Defense (DOD), attended the workshop. The event opened with a plenary session to review workshop objectives and afford DOD leaders an opportunity to address infrastructure management challenges and offer some thoughts on where the analytical community could help. Mr. Philip Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, and other senior officials including Dr. Craig College, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, Installation Management for the Army, and Ms. Anne Davis, Deputy Commander, Navy Installations Command, addressed the workshop.

Common themes expressed during the session highlighted a need for a better, more efficient approach. More specifically, it was suggested that DOD does not do an adequate job assessing the value of its current infrastructure; does not have an efficient means of planning for future infrastructure requirements; and does not have a robust and common analytical framework (applicable across all services) for measuring DOD effectiveness in achieving its infrastructure goals.

The workshop's organizing committee, co-chaired by Colonel Tim Trainor, Professor and Head of the Department of Systems Engineering at the U.S. Military Academy, laid out an aggressive game-plan for the three-day event which focused working group efforts

on the identification and development of appropriate methodologies and metrics to aid DOD decision makers in framing infrastructure discussions and making infrastructure and basing decisions. Workgroups focused on three key topics: Future Infrastructure Requirements, Performance Metrics Measuring Infrastructure Efficiencies, and World-wide Basing Assessment.

### Observations

Assessing the value of DOD infrastructure and then identifying how it can be best managed is a daunting task, one much too broad for a three-day event. The organizing committee, however, crafted objectives that successfully paired down the focus to a manageable level. Participants were also well aware that time was short so it was important to focus on the most relevant issues. An examination of those key issues, through the discriminating lens of analysts, would then provide potentially valuable feedback to DOD.

From that perspective, MORS achieved its goal. Each working group produced a set of top-level talking points to address the specific issues they were asked to review. The synthesis group then threaded the different discussions together to identify some of the more important key findings and recommendations from the workshop. The workshop executive summary report, and all associated presentations, should be available on the MORS web site ([www.mors.org](http://www.mors.org)) soon.

So, how does such an academic discussion contribute to anything worthy of action within DOD? The clever way in which the workshop was organized will help ensure its products are at least given due consider-

ation. First, the workshop objectives were generated from specific questions poised by senior DOD installation management leaders. Furthermore, those same leaders challenged the MORS community to identify how a systems analysis approach can help DOD make more informed decisions in the future. Canvassing the right leaders served to underpin the need for such a workshop, frame appropriate workshop objectives, and also stimulate workshop participation. Most important, however, is that key leaders, who asked for specific MORS input, are well positioned to direct further study and DOD action. MORS input will also be provided through its many DOD sponsoring activities and its many affiliated DOD members. While there is no promise that all ideas from such a workshop will be embraced, such academic exercises are beneficial. Well crafted MORS workshops, like this one, are important events. One can only guess the extent to which it may jumpstart the right ideas, and help DOD address one of its most challenging long term issues.

### MORS

MORS is a professional organization, jointly sponsored by the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Office of the Secretary of Defense and The Joint Staff. The objective of MORS is to enhance the quality and effectiveness of military operations research in order to better support decision making in the DOD. Additional information about MORS—its goals, history, code of ethics, membership, management, forums and publications (including the final workshop report)—can be found on its website at [www.mors.org](http://www.mors.org).

\* \* \* \* \*

This publication and other CSL publications can be found online at <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usacsl/index.asp>.

\* \* \* \* \*

## *COLLINS CENTER UPDATE WINTER 2007*

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE  
Center for Strategic Leadership  
650 Wright Avenue  
Carlisle, PA 17013-5049  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS